

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 are currently pending in the application. In the Office Action dated January 10, 2008, claims 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 were rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 19 and 39 have been amended, without acquiescence or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010). Claims 2-4, 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) and Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1). Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1). Claims 19-24 and 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1). Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1). Claims 40-42 and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1) as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1). Claim 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) and Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Franklin et al. (US 2001/0023440 A1).

Claims 1 and 39 have been amended to recite the local policy is different than another local policy determined at another local database network node that is another one of the one or more database network node and the another local policy is based on the user role. Claim 19 has been amended to recite wherein the local policy is different than another local policy determined

at another one of the one or more database network node based on the enterprise role.

Thus, the claimed invention includes two tier authorizations. At the global level, an enterprise role is associated with the user. At the local level, different local policies are associated with the user determined by locally processing the same enterprise role from the global level. Thus, the local policy for each local database network node may be different between the different local database network nodes associated with the same directory sharing the same role information. As such, claims 1, 19 and 39 includes the feature of locally processing the same role from a global source that results in different local policies as claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Moriconi does not disclose or suggest the above feature. In particular, column 4, lines 19-33 of Moriconi discloses:

In the preferred embodiment, the system comprises a policy manager located on a server for managing and distributing a local client policy based on a global security policy, and an application guard located on a client or server associated with one or more clients for managing access to securable components as specified by the local client policy. The global policy specifies access privileges of the user to securable components. The policy manager may then distribute a local client policy based on the global policy to the client or server. An application guard located on the client or server then manages authorization requests to the securable components as specified by the local client policy. Each authorization request may be recorded in an audit log to keep track of the authorization requests, whether they were granted or denied, and other useful information.

(Emphasis Added)

As such, Moriconi discloses a “global” security policy that centrally manages access privileges, and does not disclose or suggest the local policy for each local database network node may be different between the different local database network nodes associated with the same directory sharing the same role information.

Also, since Moriconi specifically requires that privileges and policies for local network nodes be centrally managed by the “global” security policy, Moriconi in fact teaches away from locally determining and interpreting at a network node a privilege/policy and from locally defining a privilege/policy at a database network node based on a user role such that the privilege/policy may be different at different network nodes based on the same user role

information. Moriconi merely uses a policy from the global level and enforces that policy at a local level.

Cohen, Franklin, and Gavrila also do not disclose or suggest the above feature, and therefore, fail to make up the deficiencies present in Moriconi. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests the above feature, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1, 19, and 39. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 19, and 39, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over the cited references and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

If the Commissioner determines that additional fees are due or that an excess fee has been paid, the Patent Office is authorized to debit or credit (respectively) Deposit Account No.

50-2518, billing reference no 7010852003.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2008

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4400
Telefax: (650) 849-4800

By:


Jasper Kwoh
Registration No.: 54,921